arXiv:1609.05408v2 [physics.chem-ph] 6 Oct 2016

Comment on "Communication: Simple and accurate uniform electron gas correlation energy for the full range of densities" [J. Chem. Phys. 145, 021101 (2016)]

Valentin V. Karasiev[1,*]

[1] *Quantum Theory Project, Departments of Physics and of Chemistry, University of Florida, Gainesville FL 32611-8435, U.S.A.*

(Dated: October 06, 2016)

PACS numbers:

Recently Chachiyo [1] presented an elegant and simple expression for the uniform electron gas (UEG) correlation energy applicable over the full range of densities. The functional has the form

$$\varepsilon_{\rm c}(r_{\rm s}) = a\ln(1+\frac{b_1}{r_{\rm s}}+\frac{b}{r_{\rm s}^2}), \qquad (1)$$

with $b_1 = b$ and $r_{\rm s}$ the usual Wigner-Seitz radius. Two sets of two parameters $\{a,\ b\}$ in Eq. (1) were defined for the spin-unpolarized and fully polarized cases from the requirement that Eq. (1) approach the correlation energy of the UEG at high density (low $r_{\rm s}$) [2]. The Chachiyo functional provides a root-mean-squared error with respect to the quantum Monte-Carlo (QMC) data [3] which is a bit smaller than that provided by the Vosko-Wilk-Nusair fit [4].

Nevertheless, closer inspection reveals that the function deviates from the QMC data at large $r_{\rm s}$ (see Fig. 1). The relative error is equal to 8.5% at $r_{\rm s} = 100$ bohr for the spin-unpolarized case. The corresponding relative error in the *total energy* per electron is 3.5% (the reference total energy components are $t_{\rm s}^{\rm TF} = 0.11$, $\varepsilon_{\rm x}^{\rm Slater} = -4.58$, $\varepsilon_{\rm c}^{\rm Ceperley-Alder} = -3.19$, all in mhartree).

The a and b parameters define the small-$r_{\rm s}$ behavior, while the term with b_1 contributes in the large-$r_{\rm s}$ regime. This means that if we define the b_1 parameter from a requirement to match the large-$r_{\rm s}$ QMC data, the problem of discrepancies at large-$r_{\rm s}$ may be resolved. The intermediate- and small-$r_{\rm s}$ behavior should remain essentially unchanged for small changes of b_1. Hence we propose to determine the b_1 parameter from the requirement that the correlation energy Eq. (1) for $r_{\rm s} = 50$ bohr is equal to the QMC value. That gives the new value, $b_1 = 1.062717673 \times b = 21.7392245$ for the spin-unpolarized case and $b_1 = 1.034121079 \times b = 28.3559732$ for the fully-polarized case.

Figure 1 shows that Eq. (1) with the new b_1 parameter values provides much better agreement with the QMC data at large-$r_{\rm s}$. There is no deterioration of the functional quality at intermediate- and small-$r_{\rm s}$. Mean absolute relative error (MARE), maximum relative error (MAX) and mean absolute error (MAE) values for the original and revised set of parameters are shown in Table I. For comparison the Table also includes data for the popular Perdew-Zunger (PZ) [5] and the more recently parametrized Karasiev-Sjostrom-Dufty-Trickey (KSDT) [6] *free-energy* functional evaluated at zero-temperature. Reference [7] shows that interpolation between known high- and low-density analytic limits can be used for accurate predictions of the correlation energy over the whole range of densities ($0 \le r_{\rm s} < \infty$), without QMC input. Of necessity they are significantly more complicated than Eq. (1). PZ parameters were fitted to the Ceperley-Alder QMC data [3]. This functional behaves almost identically with the VWN parametrization but is more widely used, especially in solid-state codes. A subset of parameters in the KSDT functional was fitted to recent QMC results [8]. The revised parameter set should make Chachiyo's simple expression even more generally useful than the original. *Acknowledgments:* This work was supported by U.S. Dept. of Energy grant de-sc0002139. Thanks to Jim Dufty and Sam Trickey for helpful discussions.



FIG. 1: Comparison among different functionals for correlation energy at large-$r_{\rm s}$ for spin-unpolarized UEG and reference QMC data.

* Electronic address: vkarasev@qtp.ufl.edu

[1] T. Chachiyo, J. Chem. Phys. **147**, 021101 (2016).
[2] P.F. Loos and P.M.W. Gill, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 033103 (2011).
[3] D.M. Ceperley and B.J. Alder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 566 (1980).

TABLE I: MARE (%), MAX (%) and MAE (hartrees) for the spin-unpolarized (u) and fully-polarized (p) UEG calculated with different functionals. All errors are calculated w/r to the Ceperley-Alder QMC data in the range $2 \leq r_s \leq 100$.

Funct.	MARE/MAX(u)	MAE(u)	MARE/MAX(p)	MAE(p)
Ref. [1]	3.7/8.5	$5.4{\cdot}10^{-4}$	2.9/8.3	$1.7{\cdot}10^{-4}$
Eq. (1)	1.8/3.3	$3.2{\cdot}10^{-4}$	2.8/5.6	$2.1{\cdot}10^{-4}$
PZ	0.4/0.7	$5.2{\cdot}10^{-5}$	0.5/1.0	$3.7{\cdot}10^{-5}$
KSDT	0.9/1.5	$1.9{\cdot}10^{-4}$	2.0/5.7	$1.4{\cdot}10^{-4}$

[4] S.H. Vosko, L. Wilk, and M. Nusair, Can. J. Phys. **58**, 1200 (1980).

[5] J.P. Perdew, and A. Zunger, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 5048 (1981).

[6] V.V. Karasiev, T. Sjostrom, J. Dufty, and S.B. Trickey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 076403 (2014).

[7] J. Sun, J.P. Perdew, and M. Seidl, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 085123 (2010).

[8] G.G. Spink, R.J. Needs, and N.D. Drummond, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 085121 (2013).